



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/650,102	08/26/2003	Kim Ngoc Vu	C1138-700110	6429

7590 03/01/2006

Robert A. Skrivanek, Jr.
Lowrie, Lando & Anastasi, LLP
One Main Street
Cambridge, MA 02142

EXAMINER

FOX, JOHN C

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

3753

DATE MAILED: 03/01/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/650,102	VU, KIM NGOC	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	John Fox	3753	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 08 February 2006.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-59 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) 42-59 is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-15, 18-34 and 37 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☒ Claim(s) 16, 17, 35, 36 and 38-41 is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|---|---|
| 1) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
| Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

This action is responsive to the communication filed February 8, 2006.

Claims 42-59 are withdrawn from further consideration pursuant to 37 CFR 1.142(b), as being drawn to a nonelected invention, there being no allowable generic or linking claim. Applicant timely traversed the restriction (election) requirement in the reply filed on August 25, 2005.

This application contains claims 42-59 drawn to an invention nonelected with traverse. A complete reply to the final rejection must include cancellation of nonelected claims or other appropriate action (37 CFR 1.144) See MPEP § 821.01.

The text of those sections of Title 35, U.S. Code not included in this action can be found in a prior Office action.

Claims 1-15 and 18-34 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Eidsmore et al '546, of record, in view of Ohmi et al '871.

Eidsmore et al show a gas stick system with substrates 40 having transverse channels 41 which take manifolds, or bridge fittings in the language of the patent, to make connections between adjacent sticks. In the embodiment of Figure 7, such transverse manifolds include the end fittings labeled 46, which has a port in a plane transverse to the top plane which contains the ports communicating with the components. Eidsmore et al show in Figure 7 a four bolt mounting pattern for the three way and two way valves. Eidsmore et al, though, use bridge fittings for the gas sticks on the inlet side of the MFC. Ohmi et al show another gas stick where the inlet side of the MFC can be either a substrate/manifold or an integral block. It would have been obvious for one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have used an

integral block instead of the substrate/manifold in Eidsmore et al, as for the inlet side of the MFC, in view of the equivalence taught by Ohmi et al.

Applicant's remarks have been fully considered but are not persuasive. The hypothetical routineer is assumed to be aware of all the pertinent art, and there is a substantial body of related art, virtually all of which is of record.

All of it, however, have many similarities. A manifold, in the broad sense, is provided to accept fluid handling components mounted on the surface thereof. Several parallel gas sticks are provided for process gasses, and some transverse gas flows are provided between the sticks, typically for purge gas.

The issue in this case is the construction of the manifold, again in the broad sense. Many patents show an integral block with drilled passages to connect ports for communicating with the fluid handling components. Many others use a block with a channel which accepts a bridge fitting. Both constructions provide ports in a common plane. Both constructions are well known in making the flow paths needed for the flow along the gas stick direction. Eidsmore et al teach the second construction for making the transverse gas flows, and also use the second construction for making the gas stick flow paths. Figure 2 of Ohmi et al is an unambiguous view of both types of constructions for making the gas stick flow paths. It is believed that Ohmi et al provide a nexus which offers a motivation to make the proposed combination, and that it is obvious to use the well known integral blocks for part of the gas stick flow path with the bridge fittings of Eidsmore et al for the transverse flow paths.

Claim 37 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Eidsmore et al in view of Ohmi et al as applied to claim 1 above, and further in view of Symington.

Eidsmore et al, as modified, teach the claimed device except for testing for leakage. Symington teaches a gas stick apparatus including a base plate with means to test the apparatus for a gas leak. It would have been obvious for one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have used such a base plate with the device of Eidsmore et al, as modified, to provide for leak testing therein.

Claims 16-17, 35-36, and 38-41 are objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.


THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL. Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to John Fox whose telephone number is 571-272-4912. The examiner can normally be reached on Increased Flextime.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Keasel Eric can be reached on 571-272-4929. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).


John Fox
Primary Examiner
Art Unit 3753